

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 19-21, 24, 25, 28-30, 32, and 34-44 stand rejected, Claim 33 is allowed, and Claims 6, 9, 13-18, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 31 are objected to. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 19-21, 24, 25, 28-30, 32, and 34-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Clinton (U.S. Patent No. 5,520,329). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 36, 39, 40, and 41

The Outstanding Office Action states that Clinton discloses a control system that limits wattage to a value less than that produced at full line voltage as claimed. However, Clinton fails to teach or disclose a power limiting function and a scaling function to limit wattage to a value less than that produced at full line voltage. Moreover, Clinton does not teach or disclose a control system for limiting wattage to a value less than that produced at full line voltage.

More specifically, Clinton employs heaters connected in series parallel to reduce their wattage to a value of the applied voltage. (Column 4, Lines 5-16). Connecting heaters in parallel to reduce wattage is not the same as using a power limiting function and a scaling function to limit wattage. The claimed invention includes a control system comprising a power limiting function and a scaling function to limit wattage, not heaters

connected in parallel to reduce their individual wattage, and therefore, Claims 1, 36, 39, 40, and 41 cannot be anticipated.

Additionally, Clinton does not disclose a scaling function to limit wattage at Column 6, Lines 44-51. Rather, an optional range factor for optimal scaling of a feedforward variable is provided that is a function of the heater duty cycle. As clearly shown in Fig. 1, the feedforward variable is an output, 18 and 19, to the controller means 32, not a power limiting function within a control system. Also in Clinton, the amount of power is changed by switching the line voltage on and off (see e.g., Column 3, Lines 62-65), not by applying a power limiting function within a control system.

Accordingly, the power control means of Clinton is not a power limiting function. The power control means of Clinton may apply full line voltage to the heaters. However, with a power limiting function, full line voltage cannot be applied. Since Clinton does not teach or disclose a power limiting function and a scaling function as a part of a control system to limit wattage, Claims 1, 36, 39, 40, and 41 cannot be anticipated and Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 42-44

Claims 2 and 42-44 depend from Claims 1 and 41, respectively, and distinguish over Clinton for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claims 1 and 41. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5

Claims 3-5 depend from Claim 1 and distinguish over Clinton for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections also be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 8, 20, 28-30, 34, and 35

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and distinguishes over Clinton for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection also be withdrawn.

Claim 8 includes a microcontroller that determines a power output scaling factor, which is scaled to apply different power levels for various applications. The limitation of a microcontroller is wholly absent from Clinton, and for this reason alone, Claim 8 cannot be anticipated. Clinton is also lacking a power output scaling factor. Clinton is limited to heaters connected in series parallel to reduce actual wattage and to a feedforward variable that is an output to a separate controller means. Since Clinton does not teach or disclose a microcontroller or a power output scaling factor, Claim 8 cannot be anticipated and Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 includes a power control means that limits and rescales output power, wherein the rescaling is accomplished through the use of a scaling factor. As stated above, Clinton is does not disclose such limiting and rescaling, and instead employs heaters in series parallel and a feedforward variable. The controller means (32) of Clinton does not limit and rescale output power by using a scaling factor. Accordingly, Claim 20 cannot be anticipated and Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection be withdrawn.

Similar to Claim 8, Claim 28 includes a microcontroller that determines a power output scaling factor. For at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 8,

Claim 28 cannot be anticipated and Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 29 also includes a power control means which limits and re-scales output power according to a scaling factor. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, Claim 29 cannot be anticipated and Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection be withdrawn. Claim 30 depends from Claim 29 and distinguishes over Clinton for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 29. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection also be withdrawn.

Similar to Claim 8, Claim 34 includes the use of a microcontroller to determine a power output scaling factor. Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 8, Claim 28 cannot be anticipated and Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection be withdrawn. Claim 35 depends from Claim 34 and distinguishes over Clinton for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 34. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this claim rejection also be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12

Claims 10-12 depend from Claim 8 and distinguish over Clinton for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections also be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 21, 24, 25, and 32

Claim 19 depends from Claim 8, Claims 21, 24, and 25 depend from Claim 20, and Claim 32 depends from Claim 29. For at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claims 8, 20, and 29, respectively, these claims cannot be anticipated.

Claims 37 and 38

Claims 37 and 38 depend from Claim 36 and distinguish over Clinton for at least the reasons stated above in connection with Claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7524.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 19 DEC 05

By: 
Kelly Burns, Reg. No. 46,361

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 726-7500 (Main)
(314) 726-7501 (Fax)

[KKB/lds]